

Annual Report 2011/2012

Grievance Clearing House

Committee Members

Robert Grondin, Chair of CAFT and Grievance Clearinghouse, Polytechnic, CTI Dept. of Engineering, **2012**

Elsie Moore, Tempe, 2010-11 Chair Governance Grievance Committee, School of Social Transformation, **2013**

Grievances Submitted to Clearing House

1. Grievant claimed that their contract with ASU was violated when they were assigned to teach two sections of a course as opposed to one large section, that this teaching assignment violated ABOR standards for the establishment of teaching assignments and that their later performance review was in retaliation for their complaining about this contract violation. Grievance was assigned to CAFT.
2. Grievant claimed that the policies for promotion and tenure used in their review were not reflective of President Crow's vision for the New American University. Grievance was assigned to CAFT.
3. Grievant claimed that process and procedure was not followed in their promotion to Associate Professor with tenure and that Senate Motion 20 of the 2008/9 academic year was not properly applied. Grievance was assigned to CAFT.
4. Grievant Claimed that process and procedure was not followed in their promotion to Full Professor. Grievance was assigned to CAFT.
5. Grievants claimed that pay was set inappropriately for Winter Session 2011, that teaching assignments issued for summer 2011 were made in retaliation for complaints about this; that the respondent ordered other ASU employees to hack into the Grievant's Blackboard site and copy the Grievants intellectual property, that said property was then used in summer courses taught at ASU and then again used in courses taught in Fall 2011. Grievance was filed in December 2011. With the exception of the Fall usage of the materials, other matters were deemed to not have been filed in a timely fashion. The matter involves complications in determining timeliness and standing (grievants filed while they were active ASU faculty but have since retired). It is currently be transferred to the Governance Grievance Committee.

6. Grievant asked the Clearinghouse to serve as an appeal panel for a decision made by the Academic Professional Grievance Committee. The matter was found to lie beyond the Clearinghouse's jurisdiction.
7. Grievant alleged that the By-Laws adopted in July 2011 were established incorrectly. The Grievance was filed in December 2011. The grievance was found to not be timely.
8. Grievant alleged that the Arizona Board of Regents had not acted properly in a matter where the grievant had asked the board to overrule decisions made by ASU administrators. The matter was found to not constitute a grievance within the jurisdiction of any of the grievance committees.
9. Grievant alleged that proper policy had not been followed in adjudicating a dispute involving misconduct in research that then led to the grievant's termination from the university. Grievance was assigned to CAFT.

Other actions

The committee drafted a worksheet to be assigned to the Grievance Services Request form in an effort to increase applicant's understanding of the issues faced in assigning jurisdiction of cases.